

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-8, 10-21, 25-27 and rejected same. With this paper, claim 10 is amended, none are canceled, and new claims 28 and 29 are added.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

At page 4, section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-7, 17-18 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins *et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,202, Hawkins hereinafter) in view of Nilsson (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,967, Nilsson hereinafter) and further in view of Taylor *et al* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0025769, Taylor hereinafter).

At Section 7 of the Office Action, claims 5, 8, 11-16, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins in view of Nilsson and further in view of Kubo (U.S. Patent No. 6,580,923).

Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner's assertion that Hawkins teaches a unitary body does not agree with what is depicted in Fig. 3A of Hawkins. The housing of an organizer in Hawkins, as shown in Figure 3A and further in Figure 3B, is not a unitary body because the main body of the housing comprises at least a front piece and a back piece. The joint between the two pieces is clearly outlined in Figure 3A. A unitary body, by definition, is a one-piece member without a joint.

Further, claim 1 is distinguishable from Hawkins in that the electronic components of the device are inserted through the open end into the housing, and the housing substantially encloses the components. In Hawkins, the lower portion 380 of the cellular element 350 is fitted into the void 320. The housing of Hawkins is so designed that it does not permit any kind of insertion of the electronic components through the void.

In response to Examiner's assertion that the unitary body of Hawkins can be combined with the tubular body in Nilsson and it would be obvious for persons skilled in the art to come up with a unitary tubular body of the present invention, the applicant respectfully submits that since the unitary body of claim 1 does not read on Hawkins, it is not possible to combine Hawkins and Nilsson to arrive at the present invention.

The Examiner acknowledges that Nilsson, in combination with Hawkins, fails to teach a plurality of apertures for receiving keys of a keymat, but asserts that a newly found reference Taylor teaches such a feature.

Applicant respectfully submits that, Taylor, filed on June 6, 2002, is not a prior art reference by itself. In a phone conversation with the Examiner on April 20, 2006, the Examiner directed the attention of the applicant's agent to a priority document of Taylor, US patent application No. 09/759,609 (US patent No. 6,680,731, Gerpheide hereinafter), priority date Jan. 11, 2000, of which Taylor is a continuation-in-part application. In Gerpheide, the features in Fig. 3 were cited by the Examiner.

The applicant fails to see any relationship between Fig. 3 of Gerpheide and the claimed limitation "plurality of apertures for receiving keys of a keymat," because what is shown in Fig. 3 of Gerpheide is a part of a structure in a computer keyboard. Claim 1 recites a housing of an electronic device. The components of the electronic device may include a keymat that is mounted on an inner wall of the housing. The construction of the keymat is not the subject matter of claim 1. Gerpheide does not show a body having a plurality of apertures in one face for receiving keys of a keymat, just a keyboard with a plurality of keys. Therefore, Gerpheide is not an analogous art of Hawkins or Nilsson and it cannot be combined with either one or both.

Based on the above, it is believed that claim 1 is patentable. Applicant respectfully requests the rejections of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 17 recites an electronic device incorporating the housing of claim 1. Claim 25 recites a method for forming the housing of claim 1. Since claim 1 is believed to be patentable, claims 17 and 25 are also believed to be patentable. Applicant respectfully requests the rejections of claims 17 and 25, and all dependent claims of claims 1, 17 and 25, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusions

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are now in condition for allowance, and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's agent urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if there are any questions.

Date: 06/06/06

Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224
Tel: (203) 261-1234
Customer No.: 004955

Respectfully submitted,



Shiming Wu
Agent for the Applicant
Registration No. 56,885